

Sent  
CS Panel System

1 Feb 84

Kaye Ann:

STAT I tried to call [ ] yesterday and found that he has been called away on some emergency. Would you call the [ ] here -- maybe Kathy, Karen, I don't remember and tell her I had a conversation with John last week in which he said that what S&T really was intending to do was to lower the evaluation level of ~~senior~~ senior secretaries from Directorate to sub-group. As you noted, this clearly says supervisors which is a lot different from a formal panel at office level. If she can add any more, fine, if it has to wait until John gets back, fine too -- but you're absolutely right, this does not say formal panel at office level.....

STAT

Let me know please.

thanks...



*Kathy is OSO reassigned.*

*Betty thinks the main issue is to have each office sub-group evaluate their secretaries, i.e., OSO, NPIC, etc. ...*

*Then make recs for DD/SET. Skies confirm w/ John's call.*

*P. 3 & 4 of PMH state "Directorate will review clerks..."*

*Per telecon w/ John & Jch, DSET wishes to chg method of eval for sr. sec. & will submit memo requesting such.*

6 Feb 88

STAT

In response to query from  SET/Per, re Panel for Secretarial Review

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: DS&T's Request to Revise Senior Secretarial Career Service Panel (SSCSP) Procedures

First, it should be remembered that the Agency's system for evaluation and promotion is based on the principle of rank-in-person and "competitiveness". This philosophy is applied to all professional groups throughout the Agency, including the secretarial workforce GS-08 and above.

The competitive (or comparative) panel evaluation system is intended to provide informed and objective assessments of employees, to minimize the potential for arbitrary personal decisions, to ensure uniformity (at least directorate-wide) and equity for all employees. Directorate evaluation panel systems guarantee individual employees being evaluated against the same standards (within the career services), and ensure conformity to the Directorate's established criteria.

Competitive evaluation by panels establishes a scheduled, organized review of all employees within each grade grouping, thus providing each employee the 'opportunity' for promotion, rotation, training, etc. If left to the employee's supervisor (e.g. to recommend for promotion, etc), the situation is exclusive, rather than inclusive. Also, if recommendations are submitted sporadically from any secretary's supervisor, by what means would the approving authority, in this case the DDS&T, have for judging the rank order for promotion, especially within the constraints of headroom, CSGA, etc.

In this same light, the panels can identify gaps, weaknesses as well as strengths, in an individual when compared to peers, and recommend training, counselling, assignment needs, etc., to make the individual more competitive - this is difficult when looking at an isolated case (i.e. comment in attached memo stating "immediate supervisor should be responsible for assigning individuals an evaluation descriptor and providing appropriate counseling...". This is a current responsibility of the supervisor in writing/reviewing AWP's, PARs, etc., and pertains to the individual performance on own merit.).

As to the statement that only one DS&T secretary has ever queried the SSCSP re ranking or promotion possibility, that doesn't necessarily imply that the Panel is wasting its time; it is possible that either disinterest or displeasure in hearing the Panel's viewpoints exist, so rather than encounter this uncomfortable situation, they avoid it.

Apparently the panel would still be required to meet to select the most qualified applicants...listed in rank order...for filling higher-graded secretarial vacancies, and these evaluations would require some comprehensive review which is the essence of the promotion evaluation process. Personally, I don't see the benefit here of dismantling the system in part and not in total when the same process can function for the two purposes (evaluation for promotion and career management).

The Agency System does not require a numerical rank order for all grade or speciality groupings; the directorate precepts seem to conform to that by requiring rank order of those being recommended for promotion, and although a descriptor must be identified for each person evaluated, no sequential order is required for other than those being recommended for promotion.



STAT

OP/PA&amp;E/P&amp;PS

Orig: S&T Eval file  
cy: chrono  
cy: C/P&PS